

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

PCT

To:

CHAS. HUDE A/S
33, H.C. Andersens Boulevard
DK-1780 Copenhagen V
DANEMARK

Sagstype PA	J.nr. 77139	Ing. TN
19 NOV. 2003		
AS 400 MSH	Til hvem KP	

**INVITATION TO RESTRICT OR
TO PAY ADDITIONAL FEES**

(PCT Rule 66)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

14.11.2003

Applicant's or agent's file reference
77139 TN/kp

**REPLY OR
PAYMENT DUE**

within 1 month(s)
from the above date of mailing

International application No.
PCT/IB03/00832

International filing date (day/month/year)
06.03.2003

Priority date (day/month/year)
07.03.2002

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
B65D65/40

Applicant
INTER IKEA SYSTEMS B.V. et al.

1. This International Examining Authority

- (i) considers that **the international application does not comply with the requirements of unity of invention** (Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3) for the reasons indicated in the Annex.
- (ii) therefore considers that there are **8 inventions** claimed in the international application as indicated in the Annex.
- (iii) recalls that claims relating to inventions in respect of which no international search report has been established need not be the subject of international preliminary examination (Rule 66.1 (e)).

2. Consequently the applicant is hereby invited, within the time limit indicated above, to restrict the claims as suggested under item 3, below, or to pay the amount indicated below:

eur 1530,00	x	7	=	eur 10710,00
Fee per additional invention		number of additional inventions		total amount of additional fees

The applicant is informed that, according to Rule 68.3 (c), **the payment of any additional fee may be made under protest**, i.e. a reasoned statement to the effect that the international application complies with the requirement of unity of invention or that the amount of the required additional fee is excessive.

- 3. If the applicant opts to restrict the claims**, this Authority suggests the restriction possibilities indicated in the Annex, which in its opinion would be in compliance with the requirement of unity of invention.
- 4. In the absence of any response** from the applicant, this Authority will establish the international preliminary examination report on those parts of the international application indicated in the Annex which, in the opinion of this Authority appear to relate to the main invention.

Name and mailing address of the international preliminary examining authority:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Cazacu, C

Tel. +49 89 2399-2645



**INVITATION TO RESTRICT
OR TO PAY ADDITIONAL FEES**

International application No. PCT/IB03/00832

1. The application lacks unity within the meaning of Rule 13.1 PCT for the following reasons:

The subject-matter of claim 1 is not new, see, e.g., document EP-A-0 424 526 (D1) (see Fig. 10, corrugated cardboard 24), WO-A-0071277 (D2) (Fig. 3).

Hence the Examining Division considers that the inventions in claims 2-7 and 9, depending directly on claim 1, are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept.

Since it is not clear on which invention or group of inventions the further prosecution of the application should be based, no further examination can be carried out.

The applicant is asked to state upon which invention further prosecution of the application should be based and to limit the application accordingly.

Alternatively, unity of the invention can be restored if the applicant finds another manner of writing the dependency of the claims (in accordance with the description, i.e., paying attention not to introduce subject-matter which extends beyond the content of the application as filed, contrary to Article 19(2) PCT).

Further remarks

However, the features of dependent claims 2-9 appear to relate to minor contructional features which, insofar as not directly disclosed in the prior art, appear to relate to obvious modifications thereof. Such features will be selected and used by the man skilled in the art as and when he needs them, without any inventive thought being required.

Therefore, the subject-matter of claims 2-14 appears to be lacking inventive step. (Article 33(3) PCT).